



Florida Department of Transportation
Advisory Memorandum
Office of Inspector General

Assignment No. 330-4002

January 25, 2005

TO: José Abreu, P.E.
Secretary

FROM: Cecil T. Bragg, Jr., C.P.A.
Inspector General

COPY: Assistant Secretary Clary, Assistant Secretary Thibault, Assistant Secretary Llort, Chief Information Officer Hill

SUBJECT: Management of EDMS Initiative
Contract P0162

Executive Summary

The purpose of this Advisory is to report interim audit results of the management of the Electronic Document Management System (EDMS) Initiative - Contract P0162. Each audit objective focuses on a different, key phase of the EDMS initiative. This interim report addresses the findings associated with Objectives 1 and 2. A subsequent report will address Objectives 3 and 4. The four audit objectives were:

- **Objective 1** – Did the project goals, procedures, specifications, and management direction effectively ensure the realization of EDMS goals as stated in Policy Statement 000-325-008?
- **Objective 2** – Did the vendor selection process for the EDMS vendor integrator fully comply with established procedures and efficiently and effectively ensure an appropriate vendor selection?
- **Objective 3** – Did the contract negotiation process fully comply with established procedures and efficiently and effectively ensure that contract terms and fees were fairly negotiated?
- **Objective 4** – Did contract and project management fully comply with established procedures and efficiently and effectively ensure the success of the EDMS project?

We conclude the project goals, procedures, specifications, and management direction did not effectively ensure the realization of EDMS goals as stated in Policy Statement 000-325-008. We did not assess or draw conclusions regarding the overall success of the EDMS initiative. Additionally, the vendor selection process did not fully comply with established procedures and did not effectively ensure an appropriate vendor selection process.

To address the global issues affecting EDMS, we recommend the Secretary task the three Assistant Secretaries with re-evaluating the goals of the EDMS initiative.



To address the systemic issues impacting both the EDMS initiative and the Department as a whole, we recommend the Secretary task the Executive Board to establish and maintain an organizational culture that balances project completion needs with compliance, transparency, and accountability. To create this balance, the Executive Board should establish the expectations that:

- Proper stewardship of State resources is a fundamental responsibility of Department managers and staff;
- Department employees must ensure that resources are used efficiently and effectively to achieve intended results; and
- Resource use must be consistent with the Department's mission, in compliance with law and regulation, and minimize the potential for waste, fraud, and mismanagement.

To establish the above expectations, the Executive Board should:

- 1) Evaluate current Department training for coverage of matters of ethics and governance and enhance project and contract manager training.
- 2) Ensure that Department project and contract managers are adequately trained in matters of fiscal responsibility. We recommend all Department project managers be required to attend the Department of Financial Services' course "Getting What You Pay For", or a comparable course.
- 3) Establish a position responsible for contract management in major functional areas to support project managers. These individuals must possess the appropriate contract management skill sets and have an ongoing program of contract management training.
- 4) Establish and require adherence to the Project Management Handbook.
- 5) Implement, enforce, and monitor adequate procurement processes and procedures, which require a detailed justification of the selection, thorough reference checks, including the vendor's Department experience, and require vendor selection committees to sign disclosure statements for actual or perceived conflicts of interest.

Introduction

This audit is being performed by the Office of Inspector General as a result of contract and project management weaknesses identified in our Contract Audit No. 140-2014; Yang Enterprises, Inc., (YEI) Contracts BA974 and P0162. The Department is engaged in legal proceedings pertaining to YEI and the former EDMS Project Manager Ms. Mavis Georgalis.

This engagement was performed in accordance with applicable Government Auditing Standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing published by the Institute of Internal Auditors.

Background

The EDMS Executive Steering Committee (ESC) originally consisted of Secretary Ben Watts and Assistant Secretaries Tom Barry and Frank Carlile. The ESC created the EDMS Task Team,



later known as the Functional Steering Committee (FSC), to review the Department's ongoing and divergent efforts in the area of document management. It was anticipated that the FSC would review Department activities, industry trends, and the experiences of other governmental entities in order to provide recommendations on how best to proceed in the area of electronic document management. The FSC reported to the ESC which exercised final decision approval authority.

Established August 19, 1993, the FSC initially consisted of 11 members from diverse Department offices. By December 1994, the FSC had grown to 27 members, including representatives from Design, Construction, Administration, Planning, General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information Systems (OIS), Rail, and District Production. Some of the FSC's more notable decisions include:

- Implementation of the Central Infrastructure Development Facility (CIDF);
- Creation of the EDMS Project Manager and CIDF Manager Positions; and
- Contracting with industry expert Universal Systems, Inc. (USI) in June of 1994, to assist in Department needs assessment, development of functional specifications, vendor evaluation, and other broad activities related to document management.

USI was tasked with analyzing the Department's document management needs and developing a plan for implementing an electronic document management system. On November 30, 1994, USI published the Functional Specifications Document which summarized the results of their analysis and detailed a comprehensive plan for implementing an enterprise-wide electronic document management system. In the Functional Specifications Document, USI recommended that the Department conduct a broad based re-engineering study and develop a re-staffing plan, both of which are common steps in a business process re-engineering initiative.

Though not well defined in its development, it is clear that the FSC envisioned broad Departmental changes which would constitute business process re-engineering and necessitate changes in both business processes and Department culture. This is further emphasized by then Assistant Secretary Barry's comments to the FSC in which he stated that EDMS included more than just documents; that it also included workflow processing and re-engineering.

Based on FSC recommendations, the Department issued Policy 000-325-008, Electronic Document Management, dated February 1, 1995, which states that it is the policy of the Department to pursue an enterprise-wide electronic document management system for both its engineering and administrative operations. The intent of this policy is to provide an automated system that will:

- Improve the efficiency of Department operations
- Reduce operating costs
- Improve customer service
- Improve quality of information maintained

This policy also designates the Functional Specifications Document as a guide and five-year implementation plan.



The position of EDMS Project Manager was originally created to coordinate the Department's consultant contract with USI. The EDMS Project Manager served as the Department's consultant liaison and was responsible for ensuring the Department's interests and expectations were met and that USI's deliverables addressed Department needs. In April of 1996, the FSC approved the establishment of the Central Infrastructure Development Facility (CIDF). The CIDF Manager was responsible for overseeing the initial setup of the CIDF and supervising pilot projects.

In July of 1995, Assistant Secretary Barry appointed Don Lyles as the first EDMS Project Manager. Dave Brazet served as the Interim EDMS Project Manager from August 1997 to February 1998 when Mavis Georgalis began as the Department's Manager of Specialized Technologies. As Specialized Technologies Manager, Ms. Georgalis functioned as both the EDMS and GIS Project Managers. Ms. Georgalis continued serving as the USI consultant contract coordinator until the contract expired.

In June of 1996, the FSC appointed Ms. Georgalis as the on-site CIDF Manager. In September of 1996, Dave Brazet, Chair of the EDMS Task Team, requested of Secretary Tom Barry that a permanent position be created for Ms. Georgalis allowing her to continue to serve as the CIDF Manager under the Central Office rather than District 2.

USI's Functional Specification Document outlined the system requirements and technical concepts used to develop a comprehensive product questionnaire for use in the procurement process. The first attempt to procure EDMS vendor integrator services, through a Request for Proposal (RFP), did not result in the selection of an EDMS vendor due to a lack of qualified vendors. A second attempt to procure these services utilized an Invitation To Negotiate (ITN).

Ms. Georgalis coordinated the procurement of EDMS vendor integrator services for Contract P0162 through the ITN. She assembled a five-person team of technical evaluators to review and score vendor responses to the product questionnaire. This team was composed of Ms. Georgalis, Lori Forster, Rick Eggers, Elwin Broome, and Frank Sullivan, and was dissolved after technical evaluations were completed.

The review of technical proposals submitted through the ITN generated a short list of vendors. In accordance with the ITN, the top two vendors, Yang Enterprises, Inc. (YEI) and Blueridge Technologies, Inc., were invited to participate in a Live Test Demonstration. After these demonstrations were scored, both vendors were asked to submit a price proposal.

YEI was selected as the EDMS vendor integrator responsible for the development and installation of an enterprise-wide EDMS. Contract P0162 was executed on January 20, 1999. YEI's proposed EDMS solution included use of the ARCIS software package developed by Siemens-Nixdorf Information Systems Inc. (Siemens-Nixdorf). Ms. Georgalis was responsible for both contract and project management on Contract P0162.

The Project Implementation Team (Project Team), under the supervision and direction of Ms. Georgalis, was responsible for the implementation of EDMS applications. The Project Team



consisted of both Department employees and consultants experienced with information technology application development. The Project Team worked on both EDMS and GIS applications.

Although YEI stopped working on the EDMS initiative in 2001, Contract P0162 was not cancelled until 2004, when replacement software for ARCIS was fully migrated to Department systems. OIS procured Hummingbird's Document Management Suite to replace ARCIS in an effort to address concerns about the ability of ARCIS to continue to meet the Department's needs.

To date, the EDMS initiative has resulted in the implementation of several electronic document management applications.

See Appendix B for timelines of the development of the EDMS initiative and the vendor selection process.

Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

As previously stated, the **objectives** covered in this Advisory Memorandum were:

- Did the project goals, procedures, specifications, and management direction effectively ensure the realization of EDMS goals as stated in Policy Statement 000-325-008, and
- Did the vendor selection process fully comply with applicable procedures, and efficiently and effectively ensure an appropriate vendor selection?

The **scope** of this audit covers information related to the EDMS initiative beginning in 1992 with the Production Management Business Area's analysis of EDMS through the cancellation of Contract P0162 in 2004. Fieldwork began in August of 2004 and is currently ongoing. Ms. Georgalis was not interviewed due to ongoing litigation. We did not assess or draw conclusions regarding the overall success of the EDMS initiative.

The **methodology** used to achieve our audit objectives included:

- 1) Best practices research;
- 2) Review of applicable statutes and procedures;
- 3) Review of the vendor selection files;
- 4) Review of the EDMS project documentation;
- 5) Analysis of planned verses actual schedules and resources;
- 6) Comparison of the vendor selection process to requirements; and
- 7) Staff interviews.



Findings and Recommendations

Audit Finding 1

Development of EDMS Initiative - Contract P0162

OBJECTIVE 1

Did the project goals, procedures, specifications, and management direction effectively ensure the realization of EDMS goals as stated in Policy Statement 000-325-008?

CONCLUSION

The project goals, procedures, specifications, and management direction did not effectively ensure the realization of EDMS goals as stated in Policy Statement 000-325-008. We did not assess or draw conclusions regarding the overall success of the EDMS initiative.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

The FSC selected an implementation strategy that was inconsistent with the stated EDMS goals. An information technology application implementation methodology was used to effect change that required a broader enterprise-wide business process re-engineering methodology. Business process re-engineering involves redesigning the way work is done to better support the organization's mission and to reduce costs. Re-engineering identifies, analyzes, and redesigns an organization's core business processes, resulting in decreased costs and improved quality, service, and speed. These expected benefits closely parallel the Department's EDMS goals as stated in Policy 000-325-008.

The FSC strategy presumes that a significant change in business processes and Department culture would happen organically (effortlessly) – this was not a reasonable expectation. The following items are symptomatic of the failure to provide adequate direction and oversight:

- The ESC did not plan or direct the initiative in a manner conducive to meeting the stated goals of the EDMS project.
- The FSC did not develop an implementation plan that included critical elements and milestones and specific time tables.
- The Functional Specification Document, designated as the guide and five-year implementation plan, emphasized application development and did not address the broader business process goals.
- EDMS requirements established in the RFP and ITN contained functional specifications for features desired by the Department but not readily available in the marketplace.
- The FSC and ESC dissolved in early 1998 with the appointment of the EDMS Project Manager. After early 1998, there was little involvement on the part of senior management.
- As the OIS Specialized Technologies Manager, the EDMS Project Manager was responsible for both GIS and EDMS.
- The EDMS Project Team lacked a clear team charter and project plan. Furthermore, the EDMS Policy defines duties for the Project Team which are inconsistent with the



achievement of the broader EDMS goals. *See Appendix A for Policy 000-325-008, Electronic Document Management.*

- The Project Team did not consist of individuals who were qualified and trained to carry out re-engineering projects and did not represent all of the functional disciplines affected by the project implementation. The Project Team did not perform re-engineering tasks such as process mapping, exploring alternative processes, defining process measures, or developing and implementing an implementation plan.
- The criteria used to select the EDMS Project Manager was inconsistent with the stated goals of the EDMS project. The key qualifications for the Project Manager focused only on experience with electronic document management, rather than on experience with implementing enterprise-wide business process re-engineering initiatives. The EDMS Project Manager did not possess the experience required to successfully bring about the Department-wide business process changes.
- The EDMS vendor integrator, YEI, did not possess the software expertise or demonstrate the requisite experience to successfully implement an EDMS. More information regarding this issue is included in Finding 2.

CRITERIA

Policy 000-325-008, Electronic Document Management

Functional Specifications Document

Policy 000-325-008 established the Functional Specifications Document as the Department's five-year guide and EDMS implementation plan. This document recommended that the Department perform a broad based re-engineering study to analyze current business practices and to determine potential re-engineering costs and benefits. The Functional Specifications Document also recommended that the Department perform a re-staffing study to address the impact of personnel changes resulting from business process re-engineering.

Best Practice Research

The Department of Defense's Business Process Re-engineering Guide, the U.S. Government Accountability Office's Business Process Re-engineering Assessment Guide, and a variety of other literature provided common characteristics of successful business process re-engineering projects. This research indicates that the following are necessary to ensure the success of the EDMS initiative:

- Ongoing involvement of senior management;
- Clear project guidance and direction;
- Well developed, clearly communicated objectives which focus on strategic business needs;
- Experience in business process re-engineering;
- Development and use of a comprehensive implementation plan;
- A charter outlining the scope and goals of the project, the team's authority and interactions with executive management, and any other special considerations; and
- A project plan that describes the activities, deliverables, and time frames for the effort and serves as the baseline for managing activities and measuring progress.



The Department of Defense's Business Process Re-engineering Guide also provided key concepts to consider when planning and executing a business process re-engineering effort, such as:

- Minimize "as-is" business process analysis;
- Streamline business operations;
- Hone in on the real business requirements and challenge processes that merely accommodate the way it has always been done;
- Reduce the cost of doing business by eliminating:
 - Obsolete and inefficient processes;
 - Obsolete regulations and controls;
 - Lengthy review and approval cycles; and
- Ensure business processes are integrated across all impacted functional areas.

CAUSE

Management did not:

- Develop an implementation methodology that was consistent with the stated goals of the EDMS;
- Provide OIS sufficient direction and oversight;
- Select a Project Implementation Team and Project Manager experienced in business process re-engineering; and
- Establish and communicate project objectives that were consistent with project goals.

IMPACT/RISK

Failure to successfully implement an enterprise-wide EDMS has resulted in the Department unnecessarily expending resources without meeting stated project goals.

RECOMMENDATION

To address the global issues affecting EDMS, we recommend the Secretary task the three Assistant Secretary for Finance and Administration with updating Electronic Document Management Policy 000-325-008 to reflect actual project goals.

We recommend the Chief Information Officer establish clear project goals, deliverables, and milestones to allow management to monitor the progress of the EDMS initiative.

Since OIS efforts are paving the way for future business process re-engineering, we recommend that the Assistant Secretary for Finance and Administration determine the role OIS will play in strengthening the Department's foundation for business process re-engineering.



MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

DRAFT



Audit Finding 2

Vendor Selection Process

OBJECTIVE

Did the vendor selection process for the EDMS vendor integrator fully comply with established procedures and efficiently and effectively ensure an appropriate vendor selection?

CONCLUSION

The vendor selection process did not fully comply with established procedures and did not effectively ensure an appropriate vendor selection.

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

While our overall conclusion is that the vendor selection process did not effectively ensure an appropriate vendor selection, the process was well executed in a number of respects:

- The vendor selection process conformed in all material respects to applicable time and resource constraints;
- The Technical Evaluation Team took an organized approach to evaluating the vendor proposals;
- The Live Test Demonstration process involved a wide cross-section of Department personnel representing diverse areas of expertise;
- USI compiled vendor reference information during the evaluation phase; and
- The ITN process required the completion of a pilot project prior to execution of the contract.

However, the following conditions are the basis for our conclusion that the vendor selection process did not effectively ensure an appropriate vendor selection:

- In their January 1998 proposal, YEI misrepresented their EDMS experience. The proposal included references for Siemens-Nixdorf installations of ARCIS software on which YEI had not participated. YEI entered into a partnership agreement with Siemens-Nixdorf in June 1998.
- YEI had not previously installed production ARCIS on an enterprise-wide basis and further had limited practical experience with electronic document management implementation.
- Under Ms. Georgalis' project management in District 2, YEI failed to deliver software under ICF Kaiser Contract C5767. This information was not disclosed to the other members of the Technical Evaluation Team.
- As the EDMS Project Manager, Ms. Georgalis did not disclose critical first-hand experience with YEI and did not heed USI warnings regarding deficiencies in YEI's practical electronic document management experience. The following quote indicated the nature of these warnings:

"Yang showed no knowledge of Document Management. They demonstrated very little knowledge of the Siemens product suite. The only product knowledge that was displayed was learned during the week before the live test demonstration. They demonstrated no ability to implement and maintain the system being proposed."

USI's Yang/Siemens Live Test Demonstration Report dated May 20, 1998



- References were not adequately considered by the Technical Evaluation Team, which resulted from the EDMS Project Manager withholding pertinent vendor performance information. The Project Manager awarded YEI 15 out of 20 points for “references,” tying the highest score Ms. Georgalis awarded in this category despite the fact that she was aware of YEI’s prior performance issues.
- All phases of the vendor selection process were not performed by at least three individuals as required by Section 287.057, F.S., and Department Procedure 375-040-020.
- YEI failed to satisfactorily complete the Live Test Demonstration project and was unsuccessful in demonstrating the ARCIS software.
- Live Test Demonstration results were not adequately considered. Source documentation was not available to verify demonstration results. Neither a comprehensive summary nor a formal statement of Live Test Demonstration results was in the procurement file or other vendor selection records.
- The two key criteria used by the EDMS Project Manager, to support the selection of YEI, were their proposed decentralized solution and compatibility with the Department’s current operating system (Windows NT Version 4.0). These two criteria were inappropriately emphasized over the primary selection criteria – the results of the technical proposal evaluations, Live Test Demonstrations and vendor references.
- YEI staffed the pilot project with one on-site individual hired after the Live Test Demonstration. This individual had no experience with ARCIS or the Department’s requirements. Ms. Georgalis directed other Department consultants to assist YEI staff with installation of ARCIS software in an attempt to implement the CDMS pilot project.
- YEI failed to successfully implement a pilot project prior to contract execution as required by the ITN. Implementation of a Construction Document Management System (CDMS) pilot project was required by the ITN as a condition of executing the contract.
- ITN requirements were further violated in that no résumés, Price Proposal scoring, or formal statement of vendor selection results were in the procurement file or other vendor selection records.

CRITERIA

Section 287.057, Florida Statutes, Procurement of Commodities and Contractual Services

This statute contains procurement requirements, including the requirement that a selection team consist of at least three employees who have experience and knowledge in the program areas and service requirements for which contractual services are sought.

Department of Management Services Memorandum #21

This memorandum provides ITN process guidelines, including basic methodologies for competitive negotiations.



Procurement Procedure 375-040-020, Procurement of Commodities and Contractual Services

This procedure requires the Contractual Services Unit to maintain a contract file which contains all pertinent documentation of the procurement, contracting, and the administrative phases. It also requires that the vendor selection process complies with Section 287.057, F.S., and that three or more people perform the selection. This procedure also describes the procurement process as the preliminary portion of the overall acquisition process, which includes the development of the scope of services, the preliminary development of payment methods/terms and conditions, the selection of the contractor, and the establishment of pricing information.

ITN Document JA0698D1, Sections 6.0, 7.1, and 7.2 Vendor Background and Evaluation.

This document:

- Requires the vendor to describe their installed base of the software product being proposed, which must include the number of installations, configuration, architecture, seats, and main customers utilizing the products;
- Establishes the evaluation and ranking criteria for each phase of the ITN process;
- Requires specific criteria and forms for developing price proposals;
- Requires vendors to provide résumés of the personnel who may be used to provide professional services; and
- States that the selected vendor will develop a pilot application that must pass a quality assurance test.

1997-1998 Sterling Quality Challenge

In its response to the Sterling Quality Challenge Self Assessment Report, the Department stated that senior leaders promote the values of hard work, quality, teamwork, honesty, loyalty, and accountability. The Department further indicated that senior leaders expect employees to adhere to the Agency's values, do the job right the first time, work in an efficient manner, and provide quality customer service.

Management Best Practices

The Department has adopted five fundamental leadership competencies necessary for excellence. These competencies emphasize the ability to develop and implement strategies to maximize employee performance excellence and foster high ethical standards in meeting the Department's vision, mission, and goals. They also require management to develop and implement an organizational vision and to incorporate that vision into the State's Transportation goals and the Department's core values. The core competencies require management to demonstrate business judgment and be able to manage and apply financial, human resources, and technology management to accomplish the organization's missions. Effective and efficient decision making epitomizes sound business judgment. Results driven management stresses accountability and continuous improvement.

Department Core Values

Integrity – We are committed to honesty, loyalty, and a high standard of ethical conduct.



Respect – We value diversity, talent, and ideas. We believe every individual should contribute and have the opportunity to be heard.

Excellence – We achieve performance excellence through hard work, innovation, creativity, and prudent risk taking.

Team Work – We accomplish more by working together and relying on each other.

CAUSE

The following factors contributed to the vendor selection process failure:

- The EDMS Project Manager withheld pertinent information and did not ensure compliance with all statutory and procedural requirements.
- The Department has not trained or developed all Project Managers to be effective Contract Managers. Effective contract management skills are necessary due to increased outsourcing and privatization.

IMPACT/RISK

An inappropriate vendor selection increases the risk that the EDMS initiative will not be successful and agency resources will be wasted.

RECOMMENDATION

To address the systemic issues impacting both the EDMS initiative and the Department as a whole, we recommend the Secretary task the Executive Board to establish and maintain an organizational culture that balances project completion needs with compliance, transparency, and accountability. To create this balance, the Executive Board should establish the expectations that:

- Proper stewardship of State resources is a fundamental responsibility of Department managers and staff;
- Department employees must ensure that resources are used efficiently and effectively to achieve intended results; and
- Resource use must be consistent with the Department's mission, in compliance with law and regulation, and minimize the potential for waste, fraud, and mismanagement.

To establish the above expectations, the Executive Board should:

- 1) Evaluate current Department training for coverage of matters of ethics and governance and enhance project and contract manager training.
- 2) Ensure that Department project and contract managers are adequately trained in matters of fiscal responsibility. We recommend all Department project managers be required to attend the Department of Financial Services' course "Getting What You Pay For", or a comparable course.



- 3) Establish a position responsible for contract management in major functional areas to support project managers. These individuals must possess the appropriate contract management skill sets and have an ongoing program of contract management training.
- 4) Establish and require adherence to the Project Management Handbook.
- 5) Implement, enforce, and monitor adequate procurement processes and procedures, which require a detailed justification of the selection, thorough reference checks, including the vendor's Department experience, and require vendor selection committees to sign disclosure statements for actual or perceived conflicts of interest.

DRAFT



MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

DRAFT



APPENDIX A

POLICY STATEMENT

Effective: February 1, 1995

Office: Information Systems

Topic No.: 000-325-008-a

ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT

It is the policy of the Department to pursue an enterprise-wide electronic document management system (EDMS) for both its engineering and administrative operations. **The intent of this policy is to provide an automated system that will:**

- o Improve the efficiency of DEPARTMENT operations
- o Reduce operating costs
- o Improve customer service
- o Improve quality of information maintained

The policy intent envisions broad changes in business processes and necessitates change in Department culture. Each of these bulleted items correlates to key business process concepts as defined in the Department of Defense's Business Process Re-engineering guide.

As a guide, the Department has adopted functional specifications (dated November 30, 1994) as a five-year implementation plan.

To oversee the development of this system and to help ensure a uniform and cost effective solution, a statewide Electronic Document Management System Task Team has been appointed by the Assistant Secretaries for Finance and Administration, Transportation Policy and District Operations. **The objective of the team is to achieve department-wide compatibility of all EDMS solutions. Through this effort, the team will attempt to make recommendations for pilot projects, review related budget issues and subsequent requests for acquisition of hardware and software, establish appropriate technical standards, and define a common indexing structure.**

The objectives of the FSC are inconsistent with the broader objectives stated above and focus solely on the information technology aspects of the project.

In order to be effective, it is essential that the team be kept apprised of any current or planned initiatives throughout the Department related to electronic document management. District Secretaries and Central Office managers should direct any related information to the appropriate Assistant Secretary for coordination with the task team. Electronic document management is defined as the automated storing, retrieving, distribution and processing of shared documents.

The task team shall provide periodic status reports to the Executive Committee and make recommendations as needed.

Ben G. Watts, P.E.
Secretary



APPENDIX B

EDMS DEVELOPMENT TIMELINE	
DATE	MILESTONE
1992	The Department's Production Management Business Area Analysis identified GIS and EDMS as information technology tools that would be critical to integrating the diverse data assets of the Department into a more unified enterprise knowledge base.
September 10, 1993	Multi-year statewide EDMS effort began with the creation of a task team appointed by the Assistant Secretaries for Finance and Administration, Transportation Policy, and District Operations. This Task Team, later known as the Functional Steering Committee, was composed of a variety of Department employees from each of the Districts. The committee members included managers and employees with diverse backgrounds.
1994	Recognizing that it lacked sufficient expertise to implement an enterprise wide EDMS system, the Department contracted with Universal Systems, Inc. (USI) to provide functional support for the EDMS effort.
1994 - 1998	USI worked with the Department to provide deliverables such as functional specifications and analysis, prioritization of pilot projects, and preliminary EDMS technical and business standards. USI submitted their deliverables in report format, detailing the background, scope, methodology, purpose, results, and recommendations of each task. USI also assisted with the evaluation of the technical proposals and Live Test Demonstrations resulting from the ITN.
1995 - 1997	The Office Inspector General conducted a proactive review of the EDMS project to help the Department benefit more fully from USI's expertise.
April 25, 1996	At the recommendation of USI, the FSC created the Central Infrastructure Development Facility (CIDF) to support the development of EDMS applications. With concurrence from the Executive Committee, the FSC agreed to expend \$250,000 for the installation of the CIDF. The first test pilot project developed in the CIDF was completed in December of 1996.
June 17, 1996	The FSC appointed Ms. Georgalis the on-site CIDF Project Manager responsible for ensuring that the CIDF was successfully implemented.
August 8, 1996	Greg Waddell, former Department employee and consultant with USI, began developing Policy 325-055-015 to establish the formal processes to implement a statewide EDMS.



EDMS DEVELOPMENT TIMELINE

DATE	MILESTONE
October 2, 1996	Greg Waddell began seeking comments on Policy 325-055-015.
December 3, 1996	Don Lyles, then EDMS Project Manager, announced that the CIDF was fully functional.
January 21, 1997	Greg Rudzik, acting CIO, submitted documentation to the Information Technology Resource Procurement Advisory Council requesting approval to acquire EDMS software and professional support services.
February 11, 1997	Policy 325-05-015 was sent to Nelson Hill, CIO, for review.
March 12, 1997	A Request for Proposal was (RFP) was issued for the EDMS vendor integrator contract.
April 7, 1997	A pre-bid conference was held to help prospective RFP respondents better understand the Department's request.
April 15, 1997	Assistant Secretary Barry completed review of Policy 325-055-015. The FSC worked to prepare response to review comments. Assistant Secretary Barry indicated that the procedure would be recirculated for Executive Review and not issued as a directive.
August 1997	From the RFP respondents, Altris was selected to negotiate with the Department.
October 22, 1997	Nelson Hill addressed the FSC to discuss his plan to create the Manager of Specialized Technologies position within OIS to oversee both EDMS and GIS. -Interim EDMS Project Manager, Dave Brazet, informed the FSC that negotiations with Altris fell through because their solution did not meet the Department's needs. The FSC voted to discontinue negotiations with Altris. -EDMS Policy 325-055-015 was put on hold pending the appointment of the Manager of Specialized Technologies.
November 12, 1997	Art Wright, Purchasing Officer, formally requested authority to use an ITN to procure the EDMS vendor integrator. The ITN is published soon after.
November 21, 1997	The RFP is officially terminated. A "No Award" status is publicly posted.
November 26, 1997	The ITN Document JA0698D1 is published.

**EDMS DEVELOPMENT TIMELINE**

DATE	MILESTONE													
November – December 1997	The ITN continues to be advertised. Bid packages are faxed to potential respondents.													
December 12, 1997	This was the deadline for submission of technical questions regarding the ITN. All questions were logged in and opened.													
December 19, 1997	Addendum #1 is mailed out. This addendum makes minor changes to the ITN package and contains additional information to be considered.													
January 1998	The Special Technology Office was created within the OIS to coordinate the development, deployment, and support of EDMS and GIS for FDOT. This office was directly supervised by Nelson Hill, CIO.													
January 6, 1998	This was the ITN response deadline. On this day, all proposals received were logged in and opened.													
January 6 – 15, 1998	Technical proposals are scored by the technical evaluation team													
January 15 – 21, 1998	Scores are posted as follows:													
	<table><thead><tr><th>Company:</th><th>Scores:</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>1) Yang Enterprises, Inc.</td><td>78.38</td></tr><tr><td>2) Blueridge Technologies, Inc.</td><td>77.05</td></tr><tr><td>3) Thermo Information Solutions</td><td>64.35</td></tr><tr><td>4) Intergraph</td><td>59.84</td></tr><tr><td>5) Computer Generated Solutions, Inc.</td><td>58.81</td></tr><tr><td>6) Image Connection</td><td>58.78</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>Non-responsive:</p> <p>Altris Judge/Bentley Lockheed Martin PC Docs Upshot</p> <p>No bids:</p> <p>Dakota Imaging OCE Seminole Office Products</p>	Company:	Scores:	1) Yang Enterprises, Inc.	78.38	2) Blueridge Technologies, Inc.	77.05	3) Thermo Information Solutions	64.35	4) Intergraph	59.84	5) Computer Generated Solutions, Inc.	58.81	6) Image Connection
Company:	Scores:													
1) Yang Enterprises, Inc.	78.38													
2) Blueridge Technologies, Inc.	77.05													
3) Thermo Information Solutions	64.35													
4) Intergraph	59.84													
5) Computer Generated Solutions, Inc.	58.81													
6) Image Connection	58.78													



EDMS DEVELOPMENT TIMELINE																									
DATE	MILESTONE																								
January 16, 1998	Altris notifies the Department of its intent to file a protest.																								
January 21, 1998	Thermo Information Systems notifies Department of its intent to file a protest.																								
January 22, 1998	Upon notification that the Department withdrew the initial posting of scores, both Altris and Thermo withdraw their protests.																								
January 22 – 30, 1998	The Department receives affirmative responses from Altris, Judge/Bentley, Lockheed Martin, PC Docs, and Upshot.																								
February 1998	Mavis Georgalis was appointed Manager of Specialized Technologies, and as such would be responsible for giving Greg Waddell of USI direction concerning the EDMS procedure. All proposals were rescored.																								
March 13, 1998	The final intended short list is posted. Scores were as follows: <table><thead><tr><th>Company:</th><th>Scores:</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>1) Yang Enterprises, Inc.</td><td>78.38</td></tr><tr><td>2) Blueridge Technologies, Inc.</td><td>77.25</td></tr><tr><td>3) Lockheed Martin</td><td>65.66</td></tr><tr><td>4) Thermo Information Solutions</td><td>64.55</td></tr><tr><td>5) Integraph</td><td>59.48</td></tr><tr><td>6) Computer Generated Solutions</td><td>58.81</td></tr><tr><td>7) Image Connection</td><td>58.58</td></tr><tr><td>8) Altris</td><td>57.93</td></tr><tr><td>9) PC Docs</td><td>56.68</td></tr><tr><td>10) Upshot, Inc.</td><td>54.18</td></tr><tr><td>11) Judge/Bentley</td><td>54.14</td></tr></tbody></table> No protests are filed.	Company:	Scores:	1) Yang Enterprises, Inc.	78.38	2) Blueridge Technologies, Inc.	77.25	3) Lockheed Martin	65.66	4) Thermo Information Solutions	64.55	5) Integraph	59.48	6) Computer Generated Solutions	58.81	7) Image Connection	58.58	8) Altris	57.93	9) PC Docs	56.68	10) Upshot, Inc.	54.18	11) Judge/Bentley	54.14
Company:	Scores:																								
1) Yang Enterprises, Inc.	78.38																								
2) Blueridge Technologies, Inc.	77.25																								
3) Lockheed Martin	65.66																								
4) Thermo Information Solutions	64.55																								
5) Integraph	59.48																								
6) Computer Generated Solutions	58.81																								
7) Image Connection	58.58																								
8) Altris	57.93																								
9) PC Docs	56.68																								
10) Upshot, Inc.	54.18																								
11) Judge/Bentley	54.14																								
March 31, 1998	Yang Enterprises, Inc. and Blueridge Technologies, Inc. were invited to participate in the Live Test Demonstrations. Additional information is requested and due by April 10, 1998.																								
May 1998	Live Test Demonstrations are performed.																								

**EDMS DEVELOPMENT TIMELINE**

DATE	MILESTONE
June 15, 1998	EDMS Project Manager, Mavis Georgalis, discusses vendor selection results with CIO Nelson Hill, Assistant Secretary Cris Speer, and Secretary Tom Barry. She indicates that the decision to select YEI over Blueridge focused on decentralized vs. centralized considerations and indicates that Blueridge could not support NT/Oracle.
June 16, 1998	The Department posts its intention to negotiate with YEI.
June 1998	YEI enters into price negotiations with the Department.
July 1998	YEI begins work on the Construction Document Management System (CDMS) pilot project.
November 1998	OIS issued the Department's planning document for GIS and EDMS. This document discussed the status of both projects and outlined the short-term and long-term strategies and critical success factors for the implementation of both projects.
January 20, 1999	FDOT signs contract with YEI.
May 1999	CDMS Pilot project is completed.
May 1999-2001	Ongoing EDMS effort which will be further detailed in a subsequent report covering Objective 4.
April 26, 2004	YEI stopped working on Contract P0162 during 2001. Contract P0162 was cancelled on April 26, 2004, after replacement software for ARCIS was fully migrated to Department systems. Contract P0162 was kept in place until this time because it was the only legal agreement the Department had concerning ARCIS software maintenance. OIS procured Hummingbird's Document Management Suite to replace ARCIS in an effort to address concerns about the ability of ARCIS to continue to meet the Department's needs.